# Exhibit 1

JUL 30 2007 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Reexam

PTO/SB/57 (07-07)
Approved for use through 07/31/2007. OMB 0651-0033
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TW

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

(Also referred to as FORM PTO-1465)

# REQUEST FOR *EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

Address to:
**Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam**
**Commissioner for Patents**
**P. O. Box 1450**
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

U.S. PTO
07/30/07

**Attorney Docket No.: X32441**

**Date: July 30, 2007**

U.S. PTO
90008775
07/30/07

1. ☒ This is a request for *ex parte* reexamination pursuant to 37 CFR 1.510 of patent number 4,935,184 issued June 19, 1990. The request is made by:
   ☐ patent owner. ☒ third party requester.

2. ☒ The name and address of the person requesting reexamination is:
   Arnold Turk, Esq.
   Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C.
   1950 Roland Clarke Place, Reston, VA 20191

3. ☒ a. A check in the amount of $ 2,520.00 is enclosed to cover the reexamination fee, 37 CFR 1.20(c)(1);
   ☒ b. The Director is hereby authorized to charge the fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(c)(1) to Deposit Account No. 19-0089 (submit duplicative copy for fee processing); or
   ☐ c. Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

4. ☒ Any refund should be made by ☐ check or ☒ credit to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.
   37 CFR 1.26(c). If payment is made by credit card, refund must be to credit card account.

5. ☒ A copy of the patent to be reexamined having a double column format on one side of a separate paper is enclosed. 37 CFR 1.510(b)(4)

6. ☐ CD-ROM or CD-R in duplicate, Computer Program (Appendix) or large table
   ☐ Landscape Table on CD

7. ☐ Nucleotide and/or Amino Acid Sequence Submission
   *If applicable, items a. – c. are required.*
   a. ☐ Computer Readable Form (CRF)
   b. Specification Sequence Listing on:
      i. ☐ CD-ROM (2 copies) or CD-R (2 copies); or
      ii. ☐ paper
   c. ☐ Statements verifying identity of above copies

8. ☐ A copy of any disclaimer, certificate of correction or reexamination certificate issued in the patent is included.

9. ☒ Reexamination of claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6-10 is requested.

10. ☒ A copy of every patent or printed publication relied upon is submitted herewith including a listing thereof on Form PTO/SB/08, PTO-1449, or equivalent.

11. ☒ An English language translation of all necessary and pertinent non-English language patents and/or printed publications is included.

08/01/2007 MTWITTY 00000001 90008775
01 FC:1812 2520.00 OP

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.510. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS: **SEND TO: Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.*

{X32441 00232592.DOC}

PTO/SB/57 (07-07)
Approved for use through 07/31/2007. OMB 0651-0033
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

12. ☒ The attached detailed request includes at least the following items:
   a. A statement identifying each substantial new question of patentability based on prior patents and printed publications. 37 CFR 1.510(b)(1)
   b. An identification of every claim for which reexamination is requested, and a detailed explanation of the pertinency and manner of applying the cited art to every claim for which reexamination is requested. 37 CFR 1.510(b)(2)

13. ☐ A proposed amendment is included (only where the patent owner is the requester). 37 CFR 1.510(e)

14. ☒ a. It is certified that a copy of this request (if filed by other than the patent owner) has been served in its entirety on the patent owner as provided in 37 CFR 1.33(c).
   The name and address of the party served and the date of service are:

| | |
|---|---|
| James Michael Kaler | Edward W. Callan |
| The Law Offices of James M. Kaler | 3830 Valley Center Drive, No.705, PMB452 |
| 9930 Mesa Rim Road Suite 200, San Diego, CA 92121 | San Diego, CA 92130 |

   Date of Service: July 30, 2007 ; or

   ☐ b. A duplicate copy is enclosed since service on patent owner was not possible.

15. Correspondence Address: Direct all communication about the reexamination to:

☒ The address associated with Customer Number: 07055
☒ *OR*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☒ Firm or Individual Name | Greenblum & Bernstein, P.L.C. | | |
| Address | 1950 Roland Clarke Place | | |
| City | Reston | State VA | Zip 20191 |
| Country | United States | | |
| Telephone | (703) 716-1191 | Email aturk@gbpatent.com | |

16. ☒ The patent is currently the subject of the following concurrent proceeding(s):
   ☐ a. Copending reissue Application No. ____
   ☐ b. Copending reexamination Control No. ____
   ☐ c. Copending Interference No. ____
   ☒ d. Copending litigation styled:
      (1) Jens E. Sorensen v. Black Decker (U.S.) Inc., et al., Civil Action No. 06-cv-1572
      (2) Jens E. Sorensen v. Tecnica USA Corp. and Nordica USA Corp., Civil Action No. 06-cv-1941
      (3) Previous litigation listed in Request

**WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.**

[signature] July 30, 2007
Authorized Signature Date

Arnold Turk 33094 ☐ For Patent Owner Requester
Typed/Printed Name Registration No. ☒ For Third Party Requester

# Exhibit 2

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 90/008,775 | 07/30/2007 | 4935184 | X32441 | 9943 |

22653 7590 10/11/2007

EDWARD W CALLAN
NO. 705 PMB 452
3830 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| | |

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2007

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

10/11/07

THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

Arnold Turk, Esq.

Greenblum & Bernstein P. L. C.

1950 Roland Clarke Place

Reston VA 20191

## *EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO 90/008775

PATENT NO. 4,935,184

ART UNIT 3992

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified ex parte reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a replly has passed, no submission on behalf of the ex parte reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

| ***Order Granting / Denying Request For Ex Parte Reexamination*** | **Control No.**<br>90/008,775 | **Patent Under Reexamination**<br>4935184 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Examiner**<br>Alan Diamond | **Art Unit**<br>3991 | |

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--***

The request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 30 July 2007 has been considered and a determination has been made. An identification of the claims, the references relied upon, and the rationale supporting the determination are attached.

Attachments: a)☐ PTO-892, b)☒ PTO/SB/08, c)☐ Other: _____

1. ☒ The request for *ex parte* reexamination is GRANTED.

RESPONSE TIMES ARE SET AS FOLLOWS:

For Patent Owner's Statement (Optional): TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication (37 CFR 1.530 (b)). **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).**

For Requester's Reply (optional): TWO MONTHS from the **date of service** of any timely filed Patent Owner's Statement (37 CFR 1.535). **NO EXTENSION OF THIS TIME PERIOD IS PERMITTED.** If Patent Owner does not file a timely statement under 37 CFR 1.530(b), then no reply by requester is permitted.

2. ☐ The request for *ex parte* reexamination is DENIED.

This decision is not appealable (35 U.S.C. 303(c)). Requester may seek review by petition to the Commissioner under 37 CFR 1.181 within ONE MONTH from the mailing date of this communication (37 CFR 1.515(c)). **EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE SUCH A PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.181 ARE AVAILABLE ONLY BY PETITION TO SUSPEND OR WAIVE THE REGULATIONS UNDER 37 CFR 1.183.**

In due course, a refund under 37 CFR 1.26 ( c ) will be made to requester:

a) ☐ by Treasury check or,

b) ☐ by credit to Deposit Account No. _____, or

c) ☐ by credit to a credit card account, unless otherwise notified (35 U.S.C. 303(c)).

Alan Diamond
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3991

cc:Requester ( if third party requester )

### *Decision on Reexamination Request*

1. A substantial new question of patentability affecting claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-10 of United States Patent Number 4,935,184 to Sorensen, is raised by the request for *ex parte* reexamination. The request for reexamination is Third Party requested.

2. Since requestor did not request reexamination of claims 3 and 5 and did not assert the existence of a substantial new question of patentability (SNQ) for such claims (see 35 U.S.C. § 302); see also 37 CFR 1.510b and 1.515), such claims will not be reexamined. This matter was squarely addressed in *Sony Computer Entertainment America Inc., et al v. Jon W. Dudas*, Civil Action No. 1:05CV1447 (E.D.Va. May 22, 2006), Slip Copy, 2006 WL 1472462. The District Court upheld the Office's discretion to not reexamine claims in a reexamination proceeding other than those claims for which reexamination had specifically been requested. The Court stated:

> "To be sure, a party may seek, and the PTO may grant, ...review of each and every claim of a patent. Moreover, while the PTO in its discretion may review claims for which ... review was not requested, nothing in the statute compels it to do so. To ensure that the PTO considers a claim for ... review, ...requires that the party seeking reexamination demonstrate why the PTO should reexamine each and every claim for which it seeks review. Here, it is undisputed that **Sony** did not seek review of every claim under the '213 and '333 patents. Accordingly, **Sony** cannot now claim that the PTO wrongly failed to reexamine claims for which **Sony** never requested review, and its argument that AIPA compels a contrary result is unpersuasive."

### *Extension of Time*

3. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will not be permitted in these proceedings because the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 apply only to "an applicant" and not to parties in a reexamination proceeding. Additionally, 35 U.S.C. 305 requires that

*ex parte* reexamination proceedings "will be conducted with special dispatch" (37 CFR 1.550(a)). Extensions of time in *ex parte* reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37 CFR 1.550(c).

***Substantial New Question of Patentability (SNQ)***

4. The presence or absence of a "substantial new question of patentability" determines whether or not reexamination is ordered.

For a "substantial new question of patentability" to be present, it is only necessary that :

A) the prior art patents and/or printed publications raise a substantial new question of patentability regarding at least one claim, i.e., the teaching of the (prior art) patents and printed publications is such that a reasonable examiner would consider the teaching to be important in deciding whether or not the claim is patentable; and

B) the same question of patentability as to the claim has not been decided by the Office in a previous examination of the patent or in a final holding of invalidity by the Federal Courts in a decision on the merits involving the claim.

A SNQ may be based solely on old art where the old art is being presented/viewed in a new light, or in a different way, as compared with its use in the earlier concluded examination(s), in view of a material new argument or interpretation in the request. (MPEP 2242).

***Request***

**5. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Moscicki (U.S. Patent 3,178,497) raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Moscicki raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen. Page 28, line 14 though page 32, seventh line from the bottom; page 56 at the start of section 8 through page 58, line 5; page 83, line 13 through page 86, line 9; page 86, line 22 through page 87, line 22; page 94, lines 1-19; page 98, line 6 through page 99, line 2; and page 107, line 18 through page 108, line 11, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Moscicki that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen were patentable. Accordingly, Moscicki raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**6. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Seima (GB 2004494 A) raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1, 2 and 6-10 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Seima raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 2 and 6-10 of Sorensen. Page 32, sixth line from the bottom, through the end of page 36; page 60, fifth line from the bottom, through page 62, line 3; page 80, line 10 through page 83, line 12; page 88, line 13 through page 89, line 15; page 95, line 13 through page 96, line 9; page 99, line 15 through page 100, line 11; page 104, line 1 through page 107, line 4; and page 109, lines 1-20, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Seima that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claims 1, 2 and 6-10 of Sorensen were patentable. Accordingly, Seima raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 2 and 6-10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**7. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Gits (U.S. Patent 2,863,241) raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claim 1 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Gits raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1 of Sorensen. Page 37, line 1 through the end of section 3 on page 40, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Gits that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claim 1 of Sorensen was patentable. Accordingly, Gits raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**8. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Shiho *et al* (U.S. Patent 4,440,820, hereinafter "Shiho") raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen. The beginning of section 4 on page 40 through the end of section 4 on page 44; page 90, lines 4-20; page 96, line 23 through page 97, line 6; page 101, lines 1-11; and page 110, lines 14-23, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Shiho that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claims 1, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen were patentable. Accordingly, Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 6-8 and 10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**9. The request indicates the Requestor considers that JP 60-119520 U to Toyota Motor (hereinafter "Toyota") raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claim 1 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Toyota raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1 of Sorensen. The beginning of section 5 on page 44 through the end of section 5 on page 48; and page 70, line 1 through page 71, line 8, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Toyota that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claim 1 of Sorensen was patentable. Accordingly, Toyota raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**10. The request indicates the Requestor considers that German Published Patent Application No. 1850999 to Echterholter raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claim 1 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Echterholter raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1 of Sorensen. The beginning of section 6 on page 48 through page 53, line 6; and page 73, line 10 through page 74, line 17, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Echterholter that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claim 1 of Sorensen was patentable. Accordingly, Echterholter raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**11. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Wright, "New vigor for two-shot molding automation... versatility... ingenuity," Modern Plastics, May 1986, pp. 79-83, (hereinafter "Modern Plastics") raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1, 6 and 8 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 6 and 8 of Sorensen. Page 53, line 7 through the end of section 7 on page 56; page 77, line 1 through page 78, line 8; page 92, line 9 through page 93, line 12; and page 102, line 16 through page 103, line 11, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Modern Plastics that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claims 1, 6 and 8 of Sorensen were patentable. Accordingly, Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 6 and 8, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**12. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Moscicki in view of Echterholter and further in view of Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Moscicki in view of Echterholter and further in view of Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen. Page 58, line 6 through the end of section 9 on page 60; page 86, lines 10-21; page 88, lines 1-12; page 95, lines 1-12; page 99, lines 3-14; and page 108, lines 12-23, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Moscicki, Echterholter and Modern Plastics that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10 of Sorensen were patentable. Accordingly, Moscicki in view of Echterholter and further in view of Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**13. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Seima in view of Echterholter and further in view of Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1 and 6-10 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Seima in view of Echterholter and further in view of Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 and

6-10 of Sorensen. Page 62, line 4 through page 64, line 3; page 89, line 16 through page 90, line 3; page 96, lines 10-22; page 100, lines 12-24; page 107, lines 5-17; and page 110, lines 1-13, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Seima, Echterholter and Modern Plastics that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claims 1 and 6-10 of Sorensen were patentable. Accordingly, Seima in view of Echterholter and further in view of Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 and 6-10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**14. At page 64, line 4 through page 67, line 18; page 90, line 21 through page 91, line 13; page 97, lines 7-16; and page 101, lines 12-22, the request indicates the Requestor considers that Schad (U.S. Patent 4,422,995) raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1 and 6-8 of Sorensen.**

Schad **does not** raise a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1 and 6-8 of Sorensen. In the prosecution of application Serial No. 07/386,012, which matured into the Sorensen patent, Schad was used to reject all the claims (1-10) under 35 USC 103(a). The rejection over Schad was overcome and the Sorensen patent was allowed after applicant amended steps (h) and (i) of claim 1 so as to recite the injection of first/second plastic material until it reaches the portion of the first/second mold cavity that defines the rim of the product. Third party requestor even admits at page 66, lines 16-18, of the request that "Schad does not specifically disclose a first injection material which 'reaches the portion of the mold cavity that defines the rim of the product.'" Third party requestor cites *KSR int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* and design choice for the obviousness of modifying Schad so that a first injection material reaches the portion of the mold cavity that defines the rim of the product (Request, pages 66-67). Third party requestor notes that "design choice" with respect to product shape was considered by the Examiner in the rejection over Schad that was mailed 10/11/1988 during prosecution of the 07/386,012 application (see page 67 of the Request). Consideration of Shad in view of *KSR int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* or "design choice" does not provide any new teaching with respect to Schad as compared with its use in the prosecution of the Sorensen patent. Accordingly, Schad is not being viewed in a new light compared with its use in the prosecution of the Sorensen patent, and thus, does not raise a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1 and 6-8 of Sorensen.

**15. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Schad in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1 and 6-8 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Schad in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 and 6-8 of Sorensen. Page 67, lines 19 through the last line on page 69; page 91, line 14 through page 92, line 8; page 97, line 17 through page 98, line 5; and page 102, lines 1-15, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Schad, Moscicki, Seima and Shiho that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claims 1 and 6-8 of Sorensen were patentable. Accordingly, Schad in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 and 6-8, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**16. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Toyota in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claim 1 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Toyota in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1 of Sorensen. Page 71, line 9 through page 73, line 9, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Toyota, Moscicki, Seima and Shiho that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claim 1 Sorensen was patentable. Accordingly, Toyota in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim

1, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**17. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Echterholter in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claim 1 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Echterholter in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1 of Sorensen. Page 74, line 18 through the last line on page 76, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Echterholter, Moscicki, Seima and Shiho that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claim 1 Sorensen was patentable. Accordingly, Echterholter in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

**18. The request indicates the Requestor considers that Modern Plastics in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability with respect to claims 1, 6 and 8 of Sorensen.**

It is agreed that consideration of Modern Plastics in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 6 and 8 of Sorensen. Page 78, line 9 through page 80, line 9; page 93, lines 13-25; and page 103, lines 12-24, of the request for reexamination are hereby incorporated by reference for their explanation of the teaching provided in Modern Plastics, Moscicki, Seima and Shiho that was not present in the prosecution of the application which became the Sorensen patent. There is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider this teaching important in deciding whether or not claims 1, 6 and 8 of Sorensen were patentable. Accordingly, Modern Plastics in view of Moscicki and further in view of Seima and Shiho raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 6 and 8, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the Sorensen patent.

***Duty to Disclose***

19. The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR 1.565(a) to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving Patent No. 4,935,184 throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. The third party requestor is also reminded of the ability to similarly apprise the Office of any such activity or proceeding throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2207, 2282 and 2286.

### *Correspondence*

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alan Diamond whose telephone number is (571) 272-1338. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 5:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571) 272-1535.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

### *Notice Re Patent Owner's Correspondence Address*

Effective May 16, 2007, 37 CFR 1.33(c) has been revised to provide that:

The patent owner's correspondence address for all communications in an *ex parte* reexamination or an *inter partes* reexamination is designated as the correspondence address of the patent.

> *Revisions and Technical Corrections Affecting Requirements for Ex Parte and Inter Partes Reexamination*, 72 FR 18892 (April 16, 2007)(Final Rule)

**The correspondence address for any pending reexamination proceeding not having the same correspondence address as that of the patent is, by way of this**

**revision to 37 CFR 1.33(c), automatically changed to that of the patent file as of the effective date.**

This change is effective for any reexamination proceeding which is pending before the Office as of May 16, 2007, including the present reexamination proceeding, and to any reexamination proceeding which is filed after that date.

Parties are to take this change into account when filing papers, and direct communications accordingly.

In the event the patent owner's correspondence address listed in the papers (record) for the present proceeding is different from the correspondence address of the patent, it is strongly encouraged that the patent owner affirmatively file a Notification of Change of Correspondence Address in the reexamination proceeding and/or the patent (depending on which address patent owner desires), to conform the address of the proceeding with that of the patent and to clarify the record as to which address should be used for correspondence.

Telephone Numbers for reexamination inquiries:

| | |
|---|---|
| Reexamination and Amendment Practice | (571) 272-7703 |
| Central Reexam Unit (CRU) | (571) 272-7705 |
| Reexamination Facsimile Transmission No. | (571) 273-9900 |

Please mail any communications to:
Attn: Mail Stop "Ex Parte Reexam"
Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Please FAX any communications to:
(571) 273-9900
Central Reexamination Unit

Please hand-deliver any communications to:
Customer Service Window
Attn: Central Reexamination Unit
Randolph Building, Lobby Level
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Signed:

Alan Diamond
Primary Examiner
Central Reexamination Unit
Art Unit 3991
(571) 272-1338

/Jerry D. Johnson/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3991

STEPHEN J. STEIN
CRU EXAMINER - AU 3991

PTO/SB/08a (05-07)
Approved for use through 09/30/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

| **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT** ( Not for submission under 37 CFR 1.99) | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Application Number | 90/008,775 |
| | Filing Date | |
| | First Named Inventor | |
| | Art Unit | 3991 |
| | Examiner Name | Diamond |
| | Attorney Docket Number | REQUEST FOR REEXAMINATION |

## U.S.PATENTS

| Examiner Initial* | Cite No | Patent Number | Kind Code[1] | Issue Date | Name of Patentee or Applicant of cited Document | Pages,Columns,Lines where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /AD/ | 1 | 2863241 | | 1958-12-09 | Gits | all |
| /AD/ | 2 | 3178497 | | 1965-04-13 | Moscicki | all |
| /AD/ | 3 | 4422995 | | 1983-12-27 | Schad | all |
| /AD/ | 4 | 4440820 | | 1984-04-03 | Shiho | all |

If you wish to add additional U.S. Patent citation information please click the Add button.

## U.S.PATENT APPLICATION PUBLICATIONS

| Examiner Initial* | Cite No | Publication Number | Kind Code[1] | Publication Date | Name of Patentee or Applicant of cited Document | Pages,Columns,Lines where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | | | | | |

If you wish to add additional U.S. Published Application citation information please click the Add button.

## FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

| Examiner Initial* | Cite No | Foreign Document Number[3] | Country Code[2] i | Kind Code[4] | Publication Date | Name of Patentee or Applicant of cited Document | Pages,Columns,Lines where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear | T[5] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

/Alan Diamond/ 10/05/2007

| **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT** ( Not for submission under 37 CFR 1.99) | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Application Number | 90/008,775 |
| | Filing Date | |
| | First Named Inventor | |
| | Art Unit | 3991 |
| | Examiner Name | Diamond |
| | Attorney Docket Number | REQUEST FOR REEXAMINATION |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /AD/ | 1 | 1 850 999 | DE | | 1962-05-03 | Echterholter | all | ☑ |
| /AD/ | 2 | 2 004 494 | GB | | 1979-04-04 | SEIMA | all | ☑ |
| /AD/ | 3 | 60-119520 U | JP | | 1985-08-13 | Toyota Motor | all | ☑ |

If you wish to add additional Foreign Patent Document citation information please click the Add button

**NON-PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS**

| Examiner Initials* | Cite No | Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc), date, pages(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published. | T5 |
|---|---|---|---|
| /AD/ | 1 | VAL WRIGHT, New Vigor For Two-Shot Molding With Automation . . . Versatility . . . Ingenuity, Modern Plastics, May 1968, pages 79-83, published in US | ☐ |

If you wish to add additional non-patent literature document citation information please click the Add button

**EXAMINER SIGNATURE**

| Examiner Signature | /Alan Diamond/ | Date Considered | 10/05/2007 |
|---|---|---|---|

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through a citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

[1] See Kind Codes of USPTO Patent Documents at www.USPTO.GOV or MPEP 901.04. [2] Enter office that issued the document, by the two-letter code (WIPO Standard ST.3). [3] For Japanese patent documents, the indication of the year of the reign of the Emperor must precede the serial number of the patent document. [4] Kind of document by the appropriate symbols as indicated on the document under WIPO Standard ST.16 if possible. [5] Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language translation is attached.

# Exhibit 3

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 90/008,976 | 12/21/2007 | 4935184 | 065640-0260 | 6753 |

22653 7590 02/21/2008

EDWARD W CALLAN
NO. 705 PMB 452
3830 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | |

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2008

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**DO NOT USE IN PALM PRINTER**

(THIRD PARTY REQUESTER'S CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS)

Pavan Agarwal

Foley & Lardner LLP

3000 K Street, NW, Suite 500

Washington, DC 20007

# *EX PARTE* REEXAMINATION COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTAL FORM

REEXAMINATION CONTROL NO. *90/008,976*.

PATENT NO. *4935184*.

ART UNIT *3991*.

Enclosed is a copy of the latest communication from the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the above identified *ex parte* reexamination proceeding (37 CFR 1.550(f)).

Where this copy is supplied after the reply by requester, 37 CFR 1.535, or the time for filing a reply has passed, no submission on behalf of the *ex parte* reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered (37 CFR 1.550(g)).

| ***Order Granting / Denying Request For Ex Parte Reexamination*** | **Control No.** 90/008,976 | **Patent Under Reexamination** 4935184 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Examiner** Krisanne Jastrzab | **Art Unit** 3991 | |

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--***

The request for *ex parte* reexamination filed 21 December 2007 has been considered and a determination has been made. An identification of the claims, the references relied upon, and the rationale supporting the determination are attached.

Attachments: a)☐ PTO-892, b)☒ PTO/SB/08, c)☐ Other: _____

1. ☒ The request for *ex parte* reexamination is GRANTED.

RESPONSE TIMES ARE SET AS FOLLOWS:

For Patent Owner's Statement (Optional): TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication (37 CFR 1.530 (b)). **EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).**

For Requester's Reply (optional): TWO MONTHS from the **date of service** of any timely filed Patent Owner's Statement (37 CFR 1.535). **NO EXTENSION OF THIS TIME PERIOD IS PERMITTED.** If Patent Owner does not file a timely statement under 37 CFR 1.530(b), then no reply by requester is permitted.

2. ☐ The request for *ex parte* reexamination is DENIED.

This decision is not appealable (35 U.S.C. 303(c)). Requester may seek review by petition to the Commissioner under 37 CFR 1.181 within ONE MONTH from the mailing date of this communication (37 CFR 1.515(c)). **EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE SUCH A PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.181 ARE AVAILABLE ONLY BY PETITION TO SUSPEND OR WAIVE THE REGULATIONS UNDER 37 CFR 1.183.**

In due course, a refund under 37 CFR 1.26 ( c ) will be made to requester:

a) ☐ by Treasury check or,

b) ☐ by credit to Deposit Account No. _____, or

c) ☐ by credit to a credit card account, unless otherwise notified (35 U.S.C. 303(c)).

/Krisanne Jastrzab/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3991

cc:Requester ( if third party requester )

71338 U.S. PTO

12/21/07

PTO/SB/08 (09-06)
Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

71338 U.S. PTO
90000970
12/21/07

| Substitute for form 1449/PTO | | | | Complete if Known | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT** | | | | **Reexamination Control Number** | Unassigned |
| Date Submitted: December 21, 2007 | | | | **Patent Number** | 4,935,184 |
| | | | | **First Named Inventor** | Jens O. Sorensen |
| Sheet | 1 | of | 2 | Attorney Docket Number | 065640-0260 |

## U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

| Examiner Initials* | Cite No.[1] | Document Number: Number-Kind Code[2] (if known) | Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY | Name of Patentee or Applicant of Cited Document | Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /K.J./ | A1 | 4,935,184 | 06/19/1990 | SORENSEN | |
| ↓ | A2 | 4,422,995 | 12/27/1983 | SCHAD | |
| | A3 | 4,508,676 | 04/02/1985 | SORENSEN | |
| /K.J./ | A4 | 3,375,554 | 04/02/1968 | BLUMER | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

## UNPUBLISHED U.S. PATENT APPLICATION DOCUMENTS

| Examiner Initials* | Cite No.[1] | U.S. Patent Application Document: Serial Number-Kind Code[2] (if known) | Filing Date of Cited Document MM-DD-YYYY | Name of Patentee or Applicant of Cited Document | Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

## FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

| Examiner Initials* | Cite No.[1] | Foreign Patent Document: Country Code[3] Number[4] Kind Code[5] (if known) | Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY | Name of Patentee or Applicant of Cited Documents | Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear | T[6] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /K.J./ | A5 | JP 59-199227 | 11/12/1984 | IDEMITSU SEKIYU KAGAKU KK | | Tr. |
| ↓ | A6 | JP 60-154022 | 08/13/1985 | FUJITSU, LTD. | | Tr. |
| | A7 | JP 58-82401 | 05/18/1983 | NISSAN MOTOR CO., LTD. | | Tr. |
| /K.J./ | A8 | JP S52-51449 | 04/25/1977 | KABUSHIKI KAISHA YOSHINO KOGYOSHO | | Tr. |
| | | | | | | |

## NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS

| Examiner Initials* | Cite No.[1] | Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.) date, page(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published. | T[6] |
|---|---|---|---|
| | A9 | ~~SUMITOMO HEAVY INDUSTRIES, LTD., *Promat 100-100/100 Sumitomo-Netstal Dual Material Injection Molding Machine*~~ | Tr. |

| Examiner Signature | /Krisanne Jastrzab/ | Date Considered | 02/20/2008 |
|---|---|---|---|

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant. 1 Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). 2 See Kinds Codes of USPTO Patent Documents at www.uspto.gov or MPEP 901.04. 3 Enter Office that issued the document, by the two-letter code (WIPO Standard ST.3). 4 For Japanese patent documents, the indication of the year of the reign of the Emperor must precede the serial number of the patent document. 5 Kind of document by the appropriate symbols as indicated on the document under WIPO Standard ST.16 if possible. 6 Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 (1-800-786-9199) and select option 2.*

PTO/SB/08 (09-06)
Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

| Substitute for form 1449/PTO | | | | Complete If Known | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT** | | | | **Reexamination Control Number** | Unassigned |
| Date Submitted: December 21, 2007 | | | | **Patent Number** | 4,935,184 |
| | | | | **First Named Inventor** | Jens O. Sorensen |
| Sheet | 2 | of | 2 | Attorney Docket Number | 065640-0260 |

**NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS**

| Examiner Initials* | Cite No.[1] | Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.) date, page(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published. | T[6] |
|---|---|---|---|
| /K.J./ | A10 | WRIGHT, "New Vigor for Two-Shot Molding with Automation," *Modern Plastics*, Vol. 45, No. 9, May 1968, pp. 78 – 83. | |
| ↓ | A11 | Plaintiff's Amended Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence , SORENSEN v. THE BLACK & DECKER CORPORATION ET AL., U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 06-cv-1572 BTM (CAB). | |
| ↓ | A12 | SORENSEN v. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COM'N., 427 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2005) | |
| ↓ | A13 | Deposition of Paul P. Brown, December 19, 2006, SORENSEN v. THE BLACK & DECKER CORPORATION ET AL., U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 06-cv-1572 BTM (CAB). | |
| /K.J./ | A14 | Plaintiffs' Local Civil Rule 56.1 Statement of Material Facts in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Based on Prior Art, U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey Newark Vicinage, CIV. No. 03-1763(HAA). | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Examiner Signature | /Krisanne Jastrzab/ | Date Considered | 02/20/2008 |
|---|---|---|---|

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant. 1 Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). 2 See Kinds Codes of USPTO Patent Documents at www.uspto.gov or MPEP 901.04. 3 Enter Office that issued the document, by the two-letter code (WIPO Standard ST.3). 4 For Japanese patent documents, the indication of the year of the reign of the Emperor must precede the serial number of the patent document. 5 Kind of document by the appropriate symbols as indicated on the document under WIPO Standard ST.16 if possible. 6 Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: **Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 (1-800-786-9199) and select option 2.*

## *Reexamination*

### Decision on Reexamination Request

A substantial new question of patentability affecting claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-10 of United States Patent Number 4,935,184 (hereinafter referred to as "the '184 patent) is raised by the request for *ex parte* reexamination. The request was filed by a Third Party on 12/21/2007.

Since requestor did not request reexamination of claims 3 and 5 and did not assert the existence of a substantial new question of patentability (SNQ) for such claims (see 35 U.S.C. § 302); see also 37 CFR 1.510b and 1.515), such claims will not be reexamined. This matter was squarely addressed in *Sony Computer Entertainment America Inc., et al v. Jon W. Dudas,* Civil Action No. 1:05CV1447 (E.D.Va. May 22, 2006), Slip Copy, 2006 WL 1472462. The District Court upheld the Office's discretion to not reexamine claims in a reexamination proceeding other than those claims for which reexamination had specifically been requested. The Court stated:

"To be sure, a party may seek, and the PTO may grant .... review of each and every claim of a patent. Moreover, while the PTO in its discretion may review claims for which ... review was not requested, nothing in the statute compels it to do so. To ensure that the PTO considers a claim for ... review, ...requires that the party seeking reexamination demonstrate why the PTO should reexamine each and every claim for which it seeks review. Here, it is undisputed that Sony did not seek review of every claim under the '213 and '333 patents. Accordingly, Sony cannot now claim that the PTO wrongly failed to reexamine claims for which Sony never requested review, and its argument that AIPA compels a contrary result is unpersuasive."

### Extensions of Time

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) will not be permitted in these proceedings because the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 apply only to "an applicant" and not to parties in a reexamination proceeding. Additionally, 35 U.S.C. 305 requires that *ex parte* reexamination proceedings "will be conducted with special dispatch" (37 CFR 1.550(a)). Extensions of time in *ex parte* reexamination proceedings are provided for in 37 CFR 1.550(c).

**Substantial New Question of Patentability (SNQ)**

The substantial new question of patentability (SNQ) is based on:

JP S59-199227 (hereinafter referred to as "JP '227")

JP 60-154022 (hereinafter referred to as "JP '022")

JP 58-82401 (hereinafter referred to as "JP '401")

JP S52-51449 (hereinafter referred to as "JP '449")

Schad, U.S. patent No. 4,422,995 (hereinafter referred to as "Schad")

Blumer U.S. patent No. 3,375,554 (hereinafter referred to as "Blumer")

Sorensen U.S. patent No. 4,508,676 (hereinafter referred to as "Sorensen")

Promot 100-100/100 (hereinafter referred to as "Promot 100")

Modern Plastics, "New Vigor for Two-Shot Molding with Automation...Versatility...Ingenuity" (hereinafter referred to as "Modern Plastics")

A discussion of the specifics follows:

**Request**

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers JP '227 as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claims 1, 6-8 and 10 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the consideration of JP '227 raises an SNQ as to claims 1, 6-8 and 10 of the '184 patent. The last paragraph of page 31 through page 42 of the request is hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the teachings provided in JP '227 regarding a method of two-shot injection molding of a part utilizing a common mold core. These teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable. Accordingly, JP '227 raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 6-8 and 10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the '184 patent.

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers JP '022 as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claims 1 and 10 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the consideration of JP '022 raises an SNQ as to claims 1 and 10 of the '184 patent. Page 43 through the top of page 47 of the request is hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the teachings provided in JP '022 regarding a method of two-shot injection molding of a part utilizing a common mold core. These teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable. Accordingly, JP '022 raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 and 10, which question has not been decided in a previous examination of the '184 patent.

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers JP '401 as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claims 1 and 10 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the consideration of JP '401 raises an SNQ as to claims 1 and 10 of the '184 patent. The bottom of page 47 through the top of page 52 of the request is hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the teachings provided in JP '401 regarding a method of two-shot injection molding of a part utilizing a common mold core. These teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable. Accordingly, JP '401 raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 and 10, which question has not been decided in previous examination of the '184 patent.

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers the combination of JP '449 and the Admitted State of the Prior Art as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claims 1 and 6-9 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the combination of JP '449 and the Admitted State of the Prior Art raises an SNQ as to claims 1 and 6-9 of the '184 patent. The bottom of page 6 through the top of page 9, page 22 beginning at "E." through the top of page 27 and page 54 through the top of page 60 of the request is hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the Admitted State of the Prior Art and the teachings in JP '449 regarding a method of molding a two-component part. These combined teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable. Accordingly, the combination of JP '449 and the Admitted State of the Prior Art, raise a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1 and 6-9, which question has not been decided in previous examination of the '184 patent.

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers the combination of JP '449, the Admitted State of the Prior Art and Schad as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claim 10 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the combination of JP '449, the Admitted State of the Prior Art and Schad raises an SNQ as to claim 10 of the '184 patent. Page 60 of the request is hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the teachings of Schad regarding the separation of mold components in a two-shot molding process as applicable to the combination of the JP '449 and the Admitted State of the Prior Art. These combined teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not this claim is patentable. Accordingly, the combination of JP '449, the Admitted State of the Prior Art and Schad, raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 10, which question has not been decided in previous examination of the '184 patent.

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers the combination of JP '449 and Modern Plastics as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claim 1 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the combination of JP '449 and Modern Plastics raises an SNQ as to claim 1 of the '184 patent. Pages 60-64 of the request are hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the combination of the teachings of JP '449 and Modern Plastic regarding a two-shot molding process. These combined teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not this claim is patentable. Accordingly, the combination of JP '449 and Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 1, which question has not been decided in previous examination of the '184 patent.

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers the combination of JP '227 and Modern Plastics as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-10 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the combination of JP '227 and Modern Plastics raises an SNQ as to claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-10 of the '184 patent. Page 65 through the top of page 68 of the request is hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the combination of teachings of JP '227 and Modern Plastics regarding a two-shot molding process. These combined teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable. Accordingly, the combination of JP '227 and Modern Plastics raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-10, which question has not been decided in previous examination of the '184 patent.

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers the combination of either JP '022 or JP '401 and Promot 100 as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claims 6-8 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the combination of JP '022 or JP '401 in view of Promot 100 raises an SNQ as to claims 6-8 of the '184 patent. The bottom of page 67 through the top of page 72 is hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the combination of teachings of JP '022 or JP '401 with Promot 100 regarding a two-shot molding process. While no date has been supplied for Promot 100, it is noted that during prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent, an IDS was submitted (6/16/1988) citing Promot 100 and noting that Figures 1 through 4 of Promot 11 illustrate the prior art described in the Background portion of the specification of the application which became the '184 patent. These combined teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teaching important in deciding whether or not these claims are patentable. Accordingly, the combination of JP '022 or JP '401 and Promot 100, raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claims 6-8, which question has not been decided in previous examination of the '184 patent.

**The request indicates that the Requestor considers the combination of either JP '227, JP '022 or JP '401 with either Blummer or Soreneson as raising a substantial new question of patentability for claim 9 of the '184 patent.**

It is agreed that the combination of either JP '227, JP '022 or JP '401 in view of either Bummer or Sorensen raises an SNQ as to claim 9 of the '184 patent. The bottom of page 72 through page 74 of the request is hereby incorporated by reference for the explanation of the combination of the teachings of any of JP '227, JP '022 or JP '401 and either Blummer or Sorensen regarding the securing of two mold components in a two-shot molding process. These combined teachings were not present in the prosecution of the application which became the '184 patent. Further, there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider these teachings important in deciding whether or not this claim is patentable. Accordingly, the combination of any of JP '227, JP '022 or JP '401 with either Blummer or Sorensen raises a substantial new question of patentability as to claim 9, which question has not been decided in previous examination of the '184 patent.

### *Duty of Disclosure*

The patent owner is reminded of the continuing responsibility under 37 CFR 1.565(a) to apprise the Office of any litigation activity, or other prior or concurrent proceeding, involving Patent No. 4,935,184 throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. The third party requester is also reminded of the ability to similarly apprise the Office of any such activity or proceeding throughout the course of this reexamination proceeding. See MPEP §§ 2207, 2282 and 2286.

### *Service of Papers*

After the filing of a request for reexamination by a third party requester, any document filed by either the patent owner or the third party requester must be served on the other party (or parties where two or more third party requester proceedings are merged) in the reexamination proceeding in the manner provided in 37 CFR 1.248. See 37 CFR 1.550(f).

### *Waiver of Right to File Patent Owner Statement*

In a reexamination proceeding, Patent Owner may waive the right under 37 C.F.R. 1.530 to file a Patent Owner Statement. The document needs to contain a statement that Patent Owner waives the right under 37 C.F.R. 1.530 to file a Patent Owner Statement and proof of service in the manner provided by 37 C.F.R. 1.248, if the request for reexamination was made by a third party requester, see 37 C.F.R 1.550(f).

**Correspondence**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisanne Jastrzab whose telephone number is 571-272-1279. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 6:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**Notice Re Patent Owner's Correspondence Address**

Effective May 16, 2007, 37 CFR 1.33(c) has been revised to provide that:

The patent owner's correspondence address for all communications in an *ex parte* reexamination or an *inter partes* reexamination is designated as the correspondence address of the patent.

> *Revisions and Technical Corrections Affecting Requirements for Ex Parte and Inter Partes Reexamination*, 72 FR 18892 (April 16, 2007)(Final Rule)

**The correspondence address for any pending reexamination proceeding not having the same correspondence address as that of the patent is, by way of this revision to 37 CFR 1.33(c), automatically changed to that of the patent file as of the effective date.**

This change is effective for any reexamination proceeding which is pending before the Office as of May 16, 2007, including the present reexamination proceeding, and to any reexamination proceeding which is filed after that date.
Parties are to take this change into account when filing papers, and direct communications accordingly.

In the event the patent owner's correspondence address listed in the papers (record) for the present proceeding is different from the correspondence address of the patent, it is strongly encouraged that the patent owner affirmatively file a Notification of Change of Correspondence Address in the reexamination proceeding and/or the patent (depending on which address patent owner desires), to conform the address of the proceeding with that of the patent and to clarify the record as to which address should be used for correspondence.

Telephone Numbers for reexamination inquiries:

| | |
|---|---|
| Reexamination and Amendment Practice | (571) 272-7703 |
| Central Reexam Unit (CRU) | (571) 272-7705 |
| Reexamination Facsimile Transmission No. | (571) 273-9900 |

Please mail any communications to:

Mail Stop *Ex Parte* Reexam
ATTN: Central Reexamination Unit
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Please FAX to:
(571) 273-9900
Central Reexamination Unit

Please hand-deliver to:
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

/Krisanne Jastrzab/
Primary Examiner
Central Reexamination Unit
Art unit 3991
(571) 272-1279

JERRY D. JOHNSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
CRU - AU 3991

/Alan Diamond/
Primary Examiner
Art ~~Unit~~ 3991